

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 13, 2007 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-38, 40-73, and 75-92 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-92 stand rejected. Claims 24, 38, 59, and 73 stand objected to. Claims 39 and 74 have been canceled.

The objection to Claims 24, 38, 59, and 73 due to an informality is respectfully traversed. Claims 24, 38, 59, and 73 have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestion.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants request that the objection to Claims 24, 38, 59, and 73 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-23, 25, 27-37, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-54, 57, 58, 60, 62-72, 74, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83-89, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,146,273 to Olsen (hereinafter referred to as "Olsen") is respectfully traversed.

Olsen describes a controller-based progressive gaming system including a controller (200) and a plurality of gaming machines (G) coupled together via a network (202). The controller (200) randomly chooses a bonus mode activation trigger, which when satisfied, starts a bonus mode time period. The trigger is between a high limit value and a low limit value. A current value is tracked in relation to the high and low limit values and the trigger, and is adjusted for each new wager made by a player and/or payout made to a player. During the bonus mode time period bonus jackpots are made to one or more eligible machines (G), wherein each bonus jackpot is paid to a random winning eligible gaming machine (G). Notably, Olsen does not describe nor suggest determining that a bonus session is active based on a location of a gaming machine and/or a type of gaming machine being played.

Claim 1 recites a system for awarding a random bonus award, wherein the system includes “a session identifier to determine if a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of the gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

Olsen does not describe nor suggest a system for awarding a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Olsen does not describe nor suggest a session identifier configured to determine if a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of the gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a randomly chosen trigger value that is between a high limit value and a low limit value, wherein a current value is tracked in relation to the high and low limit values and the trigger, and is adjusted for each new wager made by a player and/or payout made to a player. When the current value is equal to the trigger, the system starts a bonus time period and determines a set of eligible gaming machines for participation.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen.

Claims 2-22 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-22 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-22 likewise are patentable over Olsen.

Claim 23 recites a method for awarding a random bonus award, wherein the method includes “determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

Olsen does not describe nor suggest a method for awarding a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 23. More specifically, Olsen does not describe nor suggest determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a randomly chosen trigger value that is between a high limit value and a low limit value, wherein a current value is tracked in relation to the high and low limit values and the trigger, and is adjusted for each new wager made by a player and/or payout made to a player. When the current value is equal to the

trigger, the system starts a bonus time period and determines a set of eligible gaming machines for participation.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 23 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen.

Claim 39 has been canceled. Claims 25,27-37, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-54, and 57 depend from independent Claim 23. When the recitations of Claims 25,27-37, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-54, and 57 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 23, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 25,27-37, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-54, and 57 likewise are patentable over Olsen.

Claim 58 recites a computer-readable medium containing a program to award a random bonus award, wherein the program includes “software to determine whether a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

Olsen does not describe nor suggest a program to award a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 58. More specifically, Olsen does not describe nor suggest software to determine whether a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a randomly chosen trigger value that is between a high limit value and a low limit value, wherein a current value is tracked in relation to the high and low limit values and the trigger, and is adjusted for each new wager made by a player and/or payout made to a player. When the current value is equal to the trigger, the system starts a bonus time period and determines a set of eligible gaming machines for participation. As such, Olsen begins a bonus time period based on a comparison of a current jackpot value with a randomly chosen bonus period trigger value.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 58 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen.

Claim 74 has been canceled. Claims 60, 62-72, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83-89, and 92 depend from independent Claim 58. When the recitations of Claims 60, 62-72, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83-89,

and 92 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 58, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 60, 62-72, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83-89, and 92 likewise are patentable over Olsen.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-23, 25, 27-37, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51-54, 57, 58, 60, 62-72, 74, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83-89, and 92 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 24, 26, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 55, 56, 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 90, and 91 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0187834 to Rowe, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Rowe”) is respectfully traversed.

Olsen is described above. Rowe describes a system (40) for monitoring game play, including a host (44) that stores, manipulates, and/or displays collected data. The game play information is used to update a player profile with play and/or reward information, for example. Player activities may also be associated with points that are accumulated according to, for example, the type of game played, length of play, and/or an amount of money won or lost by the player.

Claim 23 recites a method for awarding a random bonus award, wherein the method includes “determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

No combination of Olsen and Rowe describes nor suggests a method for awarding a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 23. More specifically, no combination of Olsen and Rowe describes nor suggests determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a bonus time period that is based on a comparison of a current jackpot value with a randomly chosen bonus period trigger value, and Rowe describes a system for monitoring player activities, thereby allowing the system to award points to a player profile based on the player activities.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 23 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen in view of Rowe.

Claims 24, 26, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 55, and 56 depend from independent Claim 23. When the recitations of Claims 24, 26, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 55, and 56 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 23, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 24, 26, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 55, and 56 likewise are patentable over Olsen in view of Rowe.

Claim 58 recites a computer-readable medium containing a program to award a random bonus award, wherein the program includes “software to determine whether a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

No combination of Olsen and Rowe describes nor suggests a program to award a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 58. More specifically, no combination of Olsen and Rowe describes nor suggests software to determine whether a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a bonus time period that is based on a comparison of a current jackpot value with a randomly chosen bonus period trigger value, and Rowe describes a system for monitoring player activities, thereby allowing the system to award points to a player profile based on the player activities.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 58 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen in view of Rowe.

Claims 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 90, and 91 depend from independent Claim 58. When the recitations of Claims 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 90, and 91 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 58, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 90, and 91 likewise are patentable over Olsen in view of Rowe.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 24, 26, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47, 55, 56, 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 90, and 91 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 50 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0042294 to Pau, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Pau”) is respectfully traversed.

Olsen is described above. Pau describes a game machine (10) including a video display unit (14) that displays to the player a choice of two or more prize sets, from which a prize is randomly drawn. The prize sets are presented on segments of wheels (50, 52, and 54) that simulate spinning before stopping randomly on a segment that defines the prize outcome won by the player.

Claim 23 recites a method for awarding a random bonus award, wherein the method includes “determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

No combination of Olsen and Pau describes nor suggests a method for awarding a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 23. More specifically, no combination of Olsen and Pau describes nor suggests determining that a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a bonus time period that is based on a comparison of a current jackpot value with a randomly chosen bonus period trigger value, and Pau describes presenting prize sets on a series of wheels that simulate spinning before stopping randomly on a segment that defines the prize outcome won by a player.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 23 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen in view of Pau.

Claim 50 depends from independent Claim 23. When the recitations of Claim 50 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 23, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 50 likewise is patentable over Olsen in view of Pau.

Claim 58 recites a computer-readable medium containing a program to award a random bonus award, wherein the program includes “software to determine whether a bonus

session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine....”

No combination of Olsen and Pau describes nor suggests a program to award a random bonus award, as is recited in Claim 58. More specifically, no combination of Olsen and Pau describes nor suggests software to determine whether a bonus session is active based on at least one of a location of a gaming machine and a type of the gaming machine. Rather, Olsen describes a bonus time period that is based on a comparison of a current jackpot value with a randomly chosen bonus period trigger value, and Pau describes presenting prize sets on a series of wheels that simulate spinning before stopping randomly on a segment that defines the prize outcome won by a player.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 58 is submitted to be patentable over Olsen in view of Pau.

Claim 85 depends from independent Claim 58. When the recitations of Claim 85 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 58, Applicants submit that dependent Claim 85 likewise is patentable over Olsen in view of Pau.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 50 and 85 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert B. Reeser, NI
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070